

~~SECRET~~29th December, 1959.COCOM Document 3715.41/2BCOORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONITEM 1541 - CATHODE-RAY TUBES2nd and 8th December, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan,
Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. 3700.1 and 5, 3715.00/1, 3715.41/1, W.P. 1541/1 and 2.

1. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate proposed that sub-item (a) of Item 1541, as shown in COCOM Doc. No. 3715.41/1, should be changed in the following manner. Instead of: "Cathode-ray tubes specially designed or used only for radar and/or counter-measure equipment etc...", the United Kingdom Delegate would prefer to have the definition read: "Cathode-ray tubes specially designed and used only for radar and/or counter-measure equipment etc...". The Delegate explained that according to the new definition all tubes designed for radar equipment covered by Items 1501 and 1507 would be under embargo. The United Kingdom Delegation considered, however, that it would be desirable to free tubes which had originally been designed for equipment now under embargo but which were widely used at present in non-strategic equipment. The Delegate referred to tubes having a double screen, designed initially for counter-measure equipment but now widely used on commercial vessels. The object of the United Kingdom proposal was to free this kind of tube which today had civilian applications. As the United Kingdom amendment submitted in W.P. 1541/1 had not been accepted by the Committee, the United Kingdom Delegation were therefore suggesting the substitution of "and used only" for "or used only".

2. The UNITED STATES Delegate stated that the question was less simple than that. Few tubes were restricted to one application only. The case cited by the United Kingdom Delegate merely showed one side of the picture. The United States Delegate stated that the object of the definition of Item 1541 was to avoid covering cathode-ray tubes used in radar equipment not subject to embargo. He recalled that Governments always had at their disposal the procedure on servicing cases if they wished to export tubes to service equipment previously sold. The Delegate considered that it would be extremely difficult to find specifications corresponding to the United Kingdom Delegate's wishes, and to establish a general rule to determine the extent to which export of these tubes might be authorised over and above servicing cases. The Delegate stated that for cases which did not fall under the servicing procedure there existed normal exceptions procedures.

3. The GERMAN Delegate believed that the essential difficulty arose from the meaning given to the words "specially designed". Considerable quantities of equipment were designed originally for military use and subsequently found wide application in the civilian field. The German Delegate asked what the United States Delegation understood by "used only".

4. The UNITED STATES Delegate replied that the wording "used only" implied a very restricted coverage. The present case dealt with equipment which was not originally designed for radar, but which now, because of its characteristics, was used only on radars subject to embargo.

SECRET

- 2 -

COCOM Document 3715.41/2B

5. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate stated that if the United States Delegation were concerned to maintain an embargo on the most recent tubes, the United Kingdom Delegation would be prepared to accept a time cut-off of two years. On the other hand, they did not consider that recourse to the servicing procedure would be a good method of resolving the problem they had submitted to the Committee.
6. The NETHERLANDS Delegation, as a compromise between the United Kingdom and United States positions, suggested changing "used only" to "used principally" and adding: "except tubes of types which are widely used in the civilian field".
7. The UNITED STATES Delegate felt that this wording would be even more ambiguous than the solution proposed by the United Kingdom, while the United Kingdom Delegate stated that up to the present no reasonable solution to the problem had been presented.
8. The COMMITTEE agreed to entrust to a Working Group the task of finding a definition of Item 1541 which it would be possible to interpret and apply in a uniform manner in all Member States.
9. The JAPANESE Delegate confirmed in the meantime the acceptance previously given ad referendum to the definition of Item 1541 as set out in COCOM Doc. No. 3715.41/1.
10. On the 8th December, the UNITED STATES Delegate, as spokesman for the Group of Experts, submitted the Working Group's conclusions. He stated that the latter had not succeeded in resolving the problem entrusted to them, as they had been unable to reach agreement regarding the characteristics of the tubes which should remain under embargo. The Working Group had recognised that the words "specially designed for" ran the risk of maintaining under embargo tubes which were used in the civilian field. They had not succeeded in identifying the types of tube which ought to be free. The Delegate added that the Working Group had not wished to recommend any particular solution. They believed however that the choice open to the Committee was the following: either to keep the present definition, as now appearing in the Lists (and the Delegate thought that most Delegations were opposed to this solution) or else to change the definition by adding the word "only" after the word "used" as the majority of the Committee had already agreed. The Delegate urged that Governments should submit new and more precise redefinition proposals. The Working Group had indeed considered that it would be advisable to take up the question of the redefinition of Item 1541 at a later date, and they had expressed the hope that Governments would submit proposals setting out the exact specifications of the tubes they wished to see maintained under embargo.
11. Summing up the discussion, the CHAIRMAN noted that the United Kingdom Delegation was the only one unable to accept the definition of Item 1541 set out in COCOM Doc. No. 3715.41/1. He therefore suggested that the United Kingdom Delegation examine the present situation in the light of the record of the recent debate, and let the Committee have their reply as soon as possible.

CONCLUSION : The COMMITTEE agreed that if the United Kingdom Delegation confirmed the agreement given ad referendum on the 17th November, the new definition of Item 1541 would be accepted unanimously. Failing this, the Committee would keep the old definition, and in any event the question could be taken up again in the course of 1960.

SECRET